

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI  
SOUTHEASTERN DIVISION**

<b>WILLIE REED,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Plaintiff,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>v.</b>	)	<b>Case No. 1:23cv127 SNLJ</b>
	)	
<b>THE BODY SHOP TOWING AND RECOVERY, LLC, et al.,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Defendants.</b>	)	

**MEMORANDUM AND ORDER**

This matter is before the Court on review of the file following assignment to the undersigned. The Eight Circuit has admonished district courts to “be attentive to a satisfaction of jurisdictional requirements in all cases.” *Sanders v. Clemco Indus.*, 823 F.2d 214, 216 (8th Cir. 1987). “In every federal case the court must be satisfied that it has jurisdiction before it turns to the merits of other legal arguments.” *Carlson v. Arrowhead Concrete Works, Inc.*, 445 F.3d 1046, 1050 (8th Cir. 2006). “A plaintiff who seeks to invoke diversity jurisdiction of the federal courts must plead citizenship distinctly and affirmatively.” 15 James Wm. Moore, et al., *Moore’s Federal Practice* § 102.31 (3d ed. 2010). Because this action has been removed from state court to this Court, the party seeking to invoke diversity jurisdiction is the defendant; however, the party seeking removal has burden of establishing federal subject matter jurisdiction. *In re Business Men’s Assur. Co. of America*, 992 F.2d 181, 183 (8th Cir. 1993).

The Notice of Removal in this case asserts that the Court has jurisdiction over the action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332 because the lawsuit is between citizens of different States and the matter in controversy exceeds the sum of \$75,000.

One defendant in this case is a Limited Liability Company. The Eighth Circuit has held that unincorporated entities such as limited liability companies are citizens of every state of which any member is a citizen. *See GMAC Commercial Credit, LLC v. Dillard Dep't Stores, Inc.*, 357 F.3d 827, 829 (8th Cir. 2004). Thus, for the LLC parties, the Court must examine the citizenship of each member of those entities to determine whether diversity jurisdiction exists. Because it is the defendants' burden in this case to establish subject matter jurisdiction, *In re Business Men's Assur. Co. of America*, 992 F.2d at 183, the Court will grant defendant twenty-one (21) days to file an amended notice alleging facts showing the existence of the requisite diversity of citizenship of the parties. If defendants fail to timely and fully comply with this Order, the Court will dismiss this matter without prejudice for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.


Accordingly,

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that, by September 6, 2023, defendants shall file an amended notice of removal in accordance with this memorandum, setting forth the members of each limited liability company party and the citizenship of each of those members.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that if defendants do not timely and fully comply with this order, this matter will be remanded for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that all other proceedings in this case are **STAYED** pending further order of this Court.

Dated this 16th day of August, 2023.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
STEPHEN N. LIMBAUGH, JR.  
SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE